

Serial No. 10/715,396
November 22, 2006
Reply to the Office Action dated August 28, 2006
Page 4 of 5

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 2, and 5-11 are pending in this application. By this amendment, Applicant amends Claim 1, and cancels Claims 3 and 4.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that Claim 4 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the features recited in the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sakai (JP 2001-196488). Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamamoto et al. (U.S. 6,307,300). Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kishimoto (U.S. 2001/0004180). Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Baba et al. (U.S. 2002/0189832). Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tsuda et al. (U.S. 2002/0047501). Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakai, Kishimoto, Yamamoto et al., or Baba et al. in view of Katsuta (JP 2000-261284). Claims 7-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakai, Kishimoto, Yamamoto et al., or Baba et al. in view of Suga et al. (U.S. 2002/0140322).

Applicant has amended Claim 1 to include substantially the same features recited in Claim 3 and allowable Claim 4. Applicant has slightly modified the features recited in originally filed Claim 4 so as to more clearly recite the features of the present invention. Particularly, Applicant has amended Claim 1 to recite the feature of "a bump is arranged on the mounting portion such that the bump does not overlap the connecting portion in a thickness direction of the electronic component."

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art rejections of Claims 1, 2, and 5-11 are moot.

Serial No. 10/715,396
November 22, 2006
Reply to the Office Action dated August 28, 2006
Page 5 of 5

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2 and 5-11 depend upon Claim 1, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that Claim 1 is allowable.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 22, 2006

/Christopher A. Bennett #46,710/
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

KEATING & BENNETT, LLP
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 850
Tyson's Corner, VA 22102
Telephone: (703) 637-1480
Facsimile: (703) 637-1499

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett
Registration No. 46,710